

## REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-16 were withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 17-25, 28, and 29 were rejected.

Claims 31 and 32 are allowed.

Claims 26, 27, and 30 are objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewriting in independent form.

Claims 18-21 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 17 and 27-30 have been amended.

No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the Claims is respectfully requested.

### 1. Rejection/Election Requirement

Election of Group II, Claims 17-32 is affirmed. Applicant notes that Claims 1-16 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner. Applicant has not cancelled Claims 1-16 at this time.

### 2. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 17-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,731,939 to Watanabe et al. (“Watanabe”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of its amended Claim 17.

Watanabe relates to a device “to allocate channels in which the fixed-site [access point] and the mobile stations are operable pursuant to the Bluetooth, or other, standard. Greater numbers of mobile stations are permitted to communicate with the fixed-site [access point] than the limited number of mobile stations otherwise conventionally permitted to form a single [Bluetooth] piconet together with the fixed-site [access point].” (Watanabe Col 1:10-17).

In Watanabe, “each communication device, the mobile stations and the access point, are defined by an IEEE address which is of a 48-bit length. A frequency hopping pattern

by which communications are defined and . . . the timing of communications, is dependent upon the address.” (Watanabe Col 6:10-15). “The access point 22 forming the master device has one master IEEE address and one master clock associated therewith. . . . Clock offsets by slave devices adjust their clock to the master device so that all slave devices in each piconet adjust their respective clocks to the master clocks.” (Watanabe Col 6:58-67). But having “the same clock timing [results] in increased susceptibility of collision. A reduced susceptibility of collision is facilitated by adding an additional offset to the clock offsets by which the different piconets are offset from the [access point] master clock.” Col 7:1-7). In other words, Watanabe relates to a fixed-point master device servicing multiple piconets, where each of the piconets have a timing offset with respect to the access point master clock to avoid data collisions.

In contrast, Applicant’s amended Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, a “ microsequencer for use as a real-time Bluetooth baseband controller comprises: . . . a plurality of Bluetooth and native clocks operably coupled to support timing functionality of the timer circuitry according to Bluetooth specifications when in a master mode; and a plurality of externally-driven Bluetooth and native clocks operably coupled to support timing functionality of the timer circuitry according to Bluetooth specifications when in a slave mode.”

Notably, it is “advantageous to create separate and independent clocks to maintain flexibility, among other benefits, a second set of clocks, namely the externally driven real-time clock 428 and the externally driven Bluetooth clock 424 are included. Each of these two clocks, however, is driven by a received clock signal from an external clock source 436 (for example, from an external master while the device in which circuitry 400 is installed is operating as a slave).” (Specification at p. 17, ll. 14-21).

Accordingly, each and every element as set forth in Applicant’s Independent Claim 17, as amended, or its dependent Claim 23, is not found in Watanabe. See MPEP 2131 at p. 2100-73 (Rev. 2, May 2004). Claims 18-21 have been cancelled without prejudice.

**3. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,839,325 to Schmidl et al. ("Schmidl"). Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,373,791 to Ukita et al. ("Ukita"). Claims 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,131,015 to Benjaram et al. ("Benjaram"). Applicant traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration of its claims.

Claims 28 and 29 have been amended to correct minor informalities.

Claims 22, 24, 25, 28, and 29 depend either directly or indirectly from amended Independent Claim 17. Because Watanabe does not provide a basis under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) for rejection of Applicant's amended Claim 17 as submitted, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion or motivation for the hypothetical combination of Watanabe with Schmidl, Ukita, or Benjaram, as set out above, to achieve Applicant's claimed invention of Claims 22, 24, 25, 28 and 29. *See MPEP 2142 at p. 2100-128 (Rev. 2, May 2004).* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* showing has not been made.

**4. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant notes with the appreciation the indication that Claims 26, 27, and 30 would allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 27 and 30 have been amended to correct minor informalities.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of Claims 31 and 32.

**5. Conclusion**

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Claims 17 and 22-30 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an early allowance of such Claims.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at [ksmith@texaspatents.com](mailto:ksmith@texaspatents.com).

Appl. No. 10/007,435  
Amendment dated September 12, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 29, 2005

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Garlick Harrison & Markison Deposit Account No. 50-2126 (BP1906).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 12, 2005

/Kevin L. Smith/  
Kevin L. Smith, Reg. # 38,620  
Attorney for Applicant

**Garlick Harrison & Markison, LLP**  
P.O. Box 160727  
Austin, TX 78716-0727  
(972) 772-8836/office  
(972) 772-5033/facsimile